

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/010,742	Applicant(s) DILLON ET AL	
	Examiner Teresa E. Strzelecka	Art Unit 1637	

All Participants:
Status of Application: Pending

 (1) Teresa E. Strzelecka.

(3) _____.

 (2) Julie Urvater.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 11 January 2006
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.
Rejection(s) discussed:

35 U.S.C. 101, utility and 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, enablement

Claims discussed:

1, 3, 4

Prior art documents discussed:
Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Teresa Strzelecka
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Ms. Urvater was contacted to notify Applicants that Michael Woodward considered their arguments regarding utility persuasive and that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101 and 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, enablement, should be withdrawn. Examiner agreed to an addition of composition claims..